THEOLOGY

VOL. LX MAY, 1957 No. 443

Editorial

THE Joint Report on *Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.) has qualities of candour, consistency and theological definiteness that are not always to be found in such documents. It carries the subject substantially further than the 1951 Report which was entitled *Relations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland*. The change of title is significant, since the new Report is the outcome of conversations between representatives not only of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland but also of the Episcopal Church of Scotland and the Presbyterian Church of England. (Previously, the latter had been represented only by "observers".) Those taking part found themselves, in consequence, impelled to consider the relations not so much between two national churches as between the Anglican and Presbyterian forms of church order. Their findings which, it should be noted, are unanimous can therefore be regarded as addressed to Anglicans and Presbyterians throughout the world, especially wherever they are living and working side by side. An appendix to the present Report contains a list of the countries in which missionaries of the Church of Scotland and of the Church of England already co-operate in Christian Councils, and of institutions for which they are jointly responsible and where no doubt the integration of their ecclesiastical polities would be particularly prized.

But it is because of its theological quality that this Report is most to be commended for study now and eventually, we hope, as forecasting a way ahead into closer church relations that will make for the strengthening of both traditions. The signatories go out of their way to emphasize their desire that nothing precipitate shall be done, but that the Report shall be given plenty of time to be circulated and digested before any formal opinions are expressed about its proposals. In the case of the Church of England, the Archbishop of Canterbury expresses his hope that the Report will not be discussed by the Convocations until after the Lambeth Conference of 1958: at their sessions this month it is expected that they will simply commend it for study.

If that is what they do, we trust their commendation will be more effective than usual. For the Report has searching things to say about the whole constitution of the Church, and about the vocation and ministry of all its members. To members of the Church of England it puts the question whether in our system the laity are properly linked with the ordained ministry in church government and in pastoral responsibility. We hope that the forthcoming Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Synodical Government, which is con-

sidering the place of the laity in the Church of England, will put forward clear and practical proposals for a satisfactory solution of these issues and, above all, that, if this hope is fulfilled, its recommendations will be acted upon and not (as seems to be the case with the generality of such Reports) shelved indefinitely.

It would appear that Anglicans have quite as much to learn from Presbyterians about the wholeness of the Church as Presbyterians may have to learn from Anglicans about the values and virtues of episcopacy. But here too the Report sets the consideration of *episcopé* or oversight in the Church in a fresh and larger context than many previous discussions of episcopacy have done. The Report observes that *episcopé* "far from being exclusively concerned with administration, can be considered under five aspects: (*a*) Apostolic mission and authority. (*b*) The pastoral office. (*c*) The continuance of the ministry of the Word and Sacraments through ordination. (*d*) Guardianship of truth and exclusion of error. (*e*) Representation of the Church in its unity and universality." We are glad that the Presbyterians have pressed the question whether the present form of episcopal government in the Church of England does justice to these five aspects and whether the infusion of certain Presbyterian elements would not make the Church of England more fully apostolic and episcopal in the highest sense of those terms.

It is this side of the Report that Anglicans should study most closely. The proposed ways in which the Presbyterians should adopt and develop the ministry of bishops, while they seem to us unexceptionable and would have rejoiced the heart of that great and good man Archbishop Robert Leighton, may well be hotly debated north of the border, for there is a deep prejudice against the very name "bishop", and it is possible that the Presbyterians will need longer to learn their lessons than the Anglicans will to learn theirs.

Still, that a Report like this should appear, unanimously signed by its distinguished signatories, is one of the most hopeful things that has happened in the field of church relations for a long time. Can the churches show as much imagination and goodwill as their leaders?

God has a New Africa

This paper was prepared for a conference organized by the Christian Council of the Gold Coast in preparation for national independence.

THE heads of the member Churches of the Christian Council convened a special meeting of ministers and clergy to stir folk to think about the situation in which we find ourselves, especially in connexion with the effect of the changing political scene on the life and work of the Church in this country. I was invited to produce a paper for that gathering on the role of the Church in an independent nation, in other words on "The Church in the New State". It was after that meeting that I was requested to read a paper on the same subject at this Conference.

We have met together to look at the Church which we have inherited, which has developed through the years in our land, and to consider the tasks that face us and to pray that under God's guidance it may fulfil his purpose in the changing social and political situation of our country.

What then is the Church? The Church is a fellowship of men and women which has been called into being by God. It is not a man-made society but it is of God's creation. Men and women may be born into a family or nation but they are not born into the Church. They enter the Church as they come to belong to Christ and accept his way of life. A member of the Church is one who has been redeemed by Christ from his sin, who has received power to live in a quality of life in God's world as he wants him to live, and who has entered into fellowship with Christ and other believers. The Church is in this country because of the fact that there are men and women who have been redeemed from their sins and have been empowered to live a new life.

The Church is the body of Christ, a universal fellowship which transcends boundaries of nation and race. It is not bound by the limits of a particular nation. God has given to the Church his redeeming Gospel to hold in trust and offer to all men and women throughout the world. Its concern is to witness to the truth of God that outlasts all changes and differences, because it is founded on the eternal will of God, made known in Christ. His will cannot be altered to fit in with the changes and the varying circumstances of life, or the requirements of nations. To the Christian what is to be done in any given circumstances is the will of God in that situation.

What happens to the nations affects the Churches. It affects them because their members are citizens sharing the joys, hopes, aspirations and the travail of their nation. It affects them even directly as organized bodies, often adversely.

If there is no tension between the Church and society, then either the society is regenerate or the Church is conformed. Since the end of the last war, India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon and the Philippines and Indonesia had gained their independence, it will strike you with astonishment that in almost every case independence has meant trouble for the Christian Church.

In Burma the strength of the Christian community is among the hill peoples racially distinct from the Burmans. So in the Karen insurrection which for years disrupted Burma, after the achievement of independence, it was easy to identify Christians with the insurrectionists and to look upon them as politically unreliable. In India the removal of British rule has opened the way in certain places, especially in rural areas, for an aggressive Hinduism which has found means to stop access of Christians to the village well. Hindus have discriminated against Christians in educational opportunity and made them victims of petty persecution. The recent decision of Pakistan, after many years without a constitution, to become a Muslim state means that all minorities, including Christians, may be treated as second-class citizens, restricted in employment, with

Government service practically closed to them and the stigma of divided loyalty attached to them. And in the Southern Sudan there is considerable fear that political independence and Moslem rule will be greatly to the disadvantage of Christians. Is the Church in the Gold Coast going to be an exception?

It is not my intention to suggest that the Church will be subject to persecution after independence, but I think it is not out of place to remind ourselves of what has taken place in other countries which have won their freedom.

We believe that the nation as well as the Church is in God's hands and that the Church is in this country to bring the nation as well as individuals into his kingdom. If this will mean the way of the Cross for us, we must stand in the faith that God will not abandon his Church but still has a purpose for his Church in the land, a purpose that will determine the character and quality of the life of the new nation.

Christianity in the Gold Coast has been sheltered and indirectly encouraged by the British. Up to date we have taken for granted that this privileged position of the Church which is linked up in the minds of people with the advantages of Western civilization will continue, and we speak in defence of Christianity as if it were the accepted religion of the nation. We should not be compromised into believing that Government's requests for National Days of Prayer, or invitations for representation of the Churches on Government Committees, are a guarantee that Christianity is going to be the religion of the nation as such. There is a sense in which one should seek to know the motive. I am getting worried by the motive behind these requests. Is the Church to them a functional organization to be called upon occasionally to organize religious functions for the nation, or is it regarded as a fellowship of redeemed citizens called to provide the moral and religious foundation for a new sense of freedom and economic justice among the people? We should not be satisfied with the privilege of spreading "religious butter on political bread".

Christianity is at the beginning of the first stage, it is on trial. As we emerge into nationhood, casting off the rule of the people who created a Christian bias for our educational system and for some of our institutions, we shall be left to assess for ourselves what the place of the Church will be in an independent Gold Coast.

There are a few references in the N.T. to a clear direction on the subject of politics which seems so important to us to-day. It was significant for the first-century Christians to know that Jesus Christ would subject all things to himself. As we read the Epistle to the Ephesians one thing becomes absolutely clear. St Paul is mainly concerned, to use the modern phrase, that "the Church should be the Church", morally distinct and separate from the world, "a glorious Church not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish". Of course the Church never achieved in practice such perfection, but so far as it really tried to do so it was bound to make its impact on the Graeco-Roman society. It made its impact as much by its refusal to share in any relationship

based on heathenism as by its positive contribution of fellowship such as the world had not seen before. The Church was not spotless but, though persecuted, there was in fact in it a quality of life and fellowship hitherto unknown. This was so because individual Christians were different from other people, they were changed men and they had a new point of view, they looked at situations through the windows of the mind of Christ. One result of this was that new moral standards and values were created, the light of divine and redemptive love fell on all human beings, and human life and human society changed. The Church throughout the centuries has had one purpose that Christ the Lord by right of all life should in fact reign over every person in the contemporary world.

History shows that the Church has time and time again been disobedient to its master and has failed in every age in its supreme task of making Christ known as Lord of the world. I recall in this connexion a sentence in the report of C.O.P.E.C., "On the fifty years that laid the foundations of modern England the influence of the Church was almost negligible". It is said that the Archbishop of Canterbury lamented to Disraeli somewhere about 1860 that "the Church had lost the towns". "Your Grace is mistaken," replied Disraeli, "the Church never had the towns." It is said by a critic of the Church that "If the Church in Russia and elsewhere had been true to its Master, Communism as we know it to-day would not have arisen". One of the causes of such weakness springs from too close identification with a dominant culture—such as of Rome, Byzantine or Europe. Would that be said of the Church in the Gold Coast to-day?

History, however, has examples of Christian reformers who successfully fought against social evils and secured the passage of laws to protect the poor, the weak, and labour class from exploitation. The Church can be dynamic.

The task of the Church is determined by the historic moment in which it stands. Churches in different countries have to face different tasks. The tasks of the Church in Africa are different from those in Britain, the choices facing the Church in America are different from those which are prominent in Germany. The mood of the Christian faith in India and China is different from that on the European continent. The primary task of the Church everywhere is to be the Church, and the nature of the moment suggests the tasks. In Europe God's hour has come for the Church to make a fresh gathering together of the remnant.

In Germany the Church is witnessing to its faith in the face of persecution in the Eastern Zone. The Church is reassessing its task at the annual meetings of the Kirchentag (a rally of Christians), at which they discuss the big questions that affect the nation in the light of Christian teaching and faith—such as the Reunification of Germany, German Rearmament, and the consecration of the youth to the State instead of to the Lord. The Church is witnessing to the Lordship of Jesus Christ.

In India there is a combination of nationalism and a revival of the cultural elements of the old faiths. In general, Indian Christians have

welcomed the new stage in their country's history. They feel that the grounds will be removed for the accusation that the Church is foreign and therefore alien.

A new chapter in the Gold Coast has begun; it is the culmination of the struggle that has been going on for many years against external domination. Since 1948 a new political concept and a new mode of living has been instilled into the masses, and they in turn have responded with vigour hitherto unknown. Much of our traditional heritage, on which the stability of our society depended, has been severely shaken, is being rigorously scrutinized and, if necessary, will be discarded. Sanctions which imposed restraint on immorality have been undermined and not adequately replaced, people have no prop against the overwhelming temptations to which they are exposed in the new situation. Many new and far-reaching policies are being put into execution. Much of Western culture that has been introduced, including Christianity, is being re-examined. Out of this will be born a new Gold Coast radically different from the Gold Coast we know. The Church is challenged to create a new conception of life, a new spiritual atmosphere within which our political, social and economic aspirations and our ideas of freedom will find their true bearings, and to establish the relationship between freedom and responsibility.

May I be permitted to pose a few questions at this juncture, not because I am pessimistic, but because as a Church we should examine the trend of affairs in the light of what we know of God's movement in history?

What if the new cloth of the British Parliamentary system patched on the old cloth of African social system reaches near to tearing, for there is danger in sewing the old and the new cloth together? What if there is a clash of cultures?

In times of great prosperity and wealth nations tend to forget God, and sink low in morals, breeding corruption, oppression, social injustice and fraud in all their worst forms, as it was in the days of Jeroboam II, when Amos was called to witness to the righteousness of God and to preach the day of the Lord—a day of doom. What if we find the nation taking that way at this period of material prosperity and rich resources, and men indulge in luxury and wallow in the evils that luxury can breed? Will the Church retain its purity in prosperity or will it suffer the same deterioration the Lord's people ran into in the days of Amos?

What if the money economy drops, for we are in a world of sudden changes and bitter surprises, and poverty attends the general life of the people and people become crushed under taxation to maintain the country's economy and schemes?

What if the social distance between people increases in relation to the economic facilities of people, and capitalism is established in all its forms, and conditions of labour become such as would prepare the soil for Communism to thrive? What have we to offer, if the poor are oppressed by the rich, and the labourer is defrauded of his wages, and justice is bought with money?

What if with the development of Tema, and the Volta River Pro-

ject, communities and towns spring up, and people from the up-country and villages stream into these industrial centres, separated from their relatives, away from their environments, the sanctions that shape their behaviour are cast away, and drunkenness, gambling and prostitution abound?

What if with independence large numbers of different nationals and races come to settle and to build communities for themselves, and multi-racial and colour problems are heightened?

What if large groups of these various nationalities with various religious persuasions become aggressive missionaries with a desire to plant their religions—Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam? What if they introduce their faiths, and we are faced with formidable rivalry?

What if people settle down to serious thinking and work, and find their energies exhausted and resources unequal to the task, on what shall they rely for strength, will they draw on the strength that Animism had promised to offer in the past, or will they look for the strength that Christianity offers?

These questions reveal to us that in the ferment of our time there are both hopes and fears, possibilities and dangers. It is good to be convinced that people are being freed from colonialism, foreign domination, and therefore to hope for freedom. But the Christian is expected to go much deeper and to examine for example what are the things from which we are not yet free as a people: sin, superstition, fear, self, greed, ignorance, the powers of evil, threat of death and the forces that separate men. Has the Church any message of redemption from these enslavements, is the Christian community truly the place where a new life of freedom is being lived which can radically affect the life of the nation as a whole?

When wealth gives people freedom from want, will it give them freedom from anxiety? Education can give men freedom from ignorance but cannot give them freedom from fear. Has the Church a purpose big enough to satisfy all the cravings of the human heart and soul?

At a time like this we are called to bear witness afresh to the eternal truth of the Gospel, the truth that the world has a Lord, a Judge and a Saviour, Jesus Christ. Constrained by his love and directed by his command we declare again that the Gospel is the saving truth for this and for every generation, that redemption from sin and from the enslavements of the soul is possible. God has done it in Christ. We urge upon our congregations the duty of witnessing to the truth, that man does not live by bread alone, that economic welfare is a means to a greater end. Man is more than a citizen, and he has been endowed with creative power which can transform an evil situation bringing success which cannot be measured by worldly standards. The Church has been called to witness by its life that these things are true.

Hostile forces may make every effort to prevent the cause of the Gospel, but the arm of the Lord is not shortened, as evidence shows that when the whole congregation, its minister and every member of

it is committed to the task of witness, nothing can stop its advance, and that just when the power of Satan seems overwhelming the Church is granted new discoveries of the power of God.

The conversion of the world is the work of God, we are but his servants, and our first and greatest task is to give ourselves with the whole Church to unswerving prayer that the peoples of this land may turn to him; that our national life be founded upon the principles of freedom, justice and righteousness. The situation determines the tasks which the Church must endeavour to fulfil.

Those who are within the Church must be won for Christ. Evangelization must take place in the Church, every new generation must be won for Christ, every individual has to make his personal choice and dedication. Is the Church winning the present generation of young men and women for Christ?

The Church has also to win the coming generation, those who are at present in schools and colleges. The State will assume more and more responsibility for providing educational facilities for the citizens, education will become increasingly secular. A new approach to the teaching of Scripture will be required; religious instruction in schools cannot be in the hands of every teacher, for Christianity can be made distasteful and contemptible in the hand of teachers without personal conviction.

There are also many on the fringe, the occasional church-goers who need to be brought into the fullness of the Christian life. A religious campaign might be jointly organized by member Churches of the Christian Council of the Gold Coast.

There are those outside the Church. The Christian community in the Gold Coast is still a minority; only about 20-25 per cent of the whole population is Christian. We should realize that it is not easy to convert people to Christianity. Indeed, it is church members who turn to non-Christian practices and beliefs when they are faced with the problems and the crises of life.

Evangelism within the Church must result in producing a group of people fully committed to Christ, and create a spiritual temperature which can produce men with the fearless spirit of the prophets and apostles who can plead with the nation at all levels to accept God's way of life. It should produce a Christian public opinion that will make the nation sensitive to sin and to distinguish between right and wrong. Until this is done the nation is doomed. We need a program of evangelism which will reach out to all sections of the nation, breaking new ground, a real evangelical venture. The Church should become the leaven hid in the country's history.

The Church is being made increasingly conscious under the stimulus of the movement for national independence that it is not enough to produce African Christians but has also to produce Christian Africans. The task of adaptation to environment demands a waiting upon the Holy Spirit by the local Christians whose vocation it is to bring the glory and the honour of their nation—music, art, literature, etc.—into the kingdom. Christ is challenging us to offer him a truly African expression of the universal faith stripped of the

ecclesiastical history of the West. An imitation is no substitute for expression.

When we turn to the realm of theology much careful thought has to be given. In that realm the Church should seek to make its contribution to the faith of the world church in a theological idiom which is uninhibited. May it be that just as dynamic Christianity preserved the best in Roman, Greek and European cultures so we might be liberated from the half-apprehended imitation of others and submit all our nature and environment to God? In saying this I am not proposing a Church which is primarily "national" so much as "natural".

Another challenge that faces the Church is that of taking full responsibility to promote the cause of Christianity. We cannot be too grateful to the missionaries for the sacrifices they have made of men and money to plant the Church in this country. While the cry "Come over to Macedonia and help us" may be still sounding, it may now mean "help us to raise our own leaders and make our own decisions". Already missionaries are sharing in decisions with no special powers of authority in some Churches, but there is genuine fear in other quarters of pressing forward too fast towards the aim of a self-supporting, self-propagating and self-governing Church lest it lead a young Church to compromise itself into error. This can be a denial of the power of the Holy Spirit which has guided the Church in every generation and every land to face its task. There is a need to remove the nationalists' criticism that missionary-founded Churches are "spiritual colonies of the West". As the Churches themselves take up the task they will decide for themselves how the threefold ministry of Jesus—preaching, teaching and healing—is to be expressed.

Only too often the witness of the Church is weakened by its divisions. Despite the great and hopeful measure of co-operation achieved among the member Churches of the Christian Council, anyone who has seen four different denominational church buildings standing in a row in a village or noted the rapid increase in the number of sects in the country, or even felt something of the drain on energies and resources needed to keep the co-operative machinery going, must bear on his heart something of the cost of our disunity. Instances of unhappy competition and rivalry are not wanting. Disunity is both a stumbling-block to the faithful and a mockery to those outside the Church, and a weakening factor to our witness. Do we wonder at our ineffective witness to political party rivalry? Do we wonder we cannot speak with one voice on some pertinent issues? The Christian Council is in need of inspiration and prompting from the congregations and needs to see that at the grass roots interest in co-operative work is increasing. If it will not be possible to conceive a scheme of Christian union in the near future may we pray for a deeper and a more effective co-operation which will ultimately arouse the desire for Christian union? May the day soon dawn when the Churches will be able to confront the nation with a united witness, strong and pertinent.

The Church must be the Church if it is to be able to make its

engagement with a nation which is becoming more and more secular and materialistic in outlook and tendencies, a nation with an overwhelming majority of its less sophisticated population living in villages.

To be the Church means to be what Christ wants it to be in life and witness, to minister to human need wherever found. To be the Church is to fulfil the calling of the watchman who speaks boldly in the name of the Lord to the nation and to those in authority with love and with tenderness.

Finally, we have to bear in mind that the Church is God's and the task is his. Alongside the processes of change which are going on in the country there is a process of change which belongs to God alone, the process of changing sinful men and women into righteous men and women. The Church is the only institution in the world which has evidence of this miracle; it is called the miracle of conversion. He is performing the miracle of changing the nation by love and by judgment. The victory shall be his. May the Church be obedient to God and faithful to its task, and win the Gold Coast which they want to call *Ghana* for God, and we shall be able to say, Yes, in the Gold Coast, *God has a new Africa—Ghana.*

P. K. Dagadu.

The Logical Character of Resurrection-belief

"Many men to-day are encouraged to regard religion as a cheat because they suspect their preceptors of failing to face the results of scientific discovery and biblical criticism . . . and even of not telling the whole truth as they see it." So says H. J. Paton in his Gifford Lectures, *The Modern Predicament.* No doubt something of what Paton has in mind might be developed by saying that there seems often a discrepancy, a gap, between preaching and teaching, between sermons and theology: a gap of which theological students, young curates and directors of post-ordination training are (amongst others) painfully aware. The gap yawns wide at all the historical commemorations of the Church's year; it is perhaps most threatening of all at Easter. The apostles (we are told) "with great power gave their witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus".[1] By contrast, Paton would say, contemporary witness is superficial if not disingenuous.

Did the Resurrection occur? The burden of Easter sermons is that it did; and all Christians to be Christians must believe that it did.

But there is then the other side which leads to Paton's dissatisfaction, and which creates, he would say, part of the "modern predicament". . . .

What of biblical criticism—not to say scientific discovery? Do we as Christians believe that Jesus walked through closed doors?[2] Do we believe that he appeared after death with "flesh and bones" and ate fish?[3] Of course, there may be and are variant readings, and verses of

[1] Acts 4. 33. [2] Cp. John 20. 19. [3] Luke 24. 39, 43.

doubtful authenticity by which to meet this point or that . . . but, what is then left of the Resurrection? Is it enough to say with one commentator after another: "The difficulty of harmonizing the different accounts of the Resurrection is great", yet "dishonesty would have made the evidence more harmonious" so that the discrepancies "show rather the comparative independence of the writers" and all the more "confirm their united testimony to the main fact on which they all agree"—the empty tomb. At any rate a critical attitude towards the New Testament has meant that the "Resurrection" has been taken to describe an ever-narrowing class of events, leaving for some only the empty tomb. But then comes the question: How long will it be before even this remnant is discredited? Meanwhile, if the Scripture holds all these difficulties, is our religion already a cheat? Can we preach the Resurrection against such a background of theological reservations and difficulties? Can we legitimately profess belief in the Resurrection while having reservations about the closed doors and the fish? Must our witness of the Resurrection be intellectually compromised? Must our sermons be isolated from our theology?

We shall meet questions such as these only by answering first the question: What *is* Christian belief in the Resurrection? and it is with that question that this article will for the most part be concerned. So many of our present difficulties arise because belief that the Resurrection occurred is often taken to be logically isomorphous with belief that certain facts like "eating fish" occurred. But is that logical assimilation justified?

Two hundred years ago the answer to this question would have been an easy "Yes"; but let us realize from the outset that it is this easy answer which leads straight to the difficulties we have been enumerating. The Resurrection was, we read, "a thing to be judg'd of by men's senses", it was a "Matter of Fact and an object of sense".[1] The worst that disbelievers like Thomas Woolston could do was to argue that the Resurrection was an *imposture*; to counter such assertions it was enough that believers like Thomas Sherlock should describe a mock *Tryal of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus* so as to establish that the apostles were "not guilty" of giving false evidence. The Resurrection was something which could be evidenced —that was common ground: the apostles were witnesses to a "Matter of Fact and an object of sense". The view has survived, of course, to our own day. Some ten years ago I chanced to have rooms in a Victorian vicarage, over the wash-basin of which was the saying of a certain nineteenth-century bishop—I think none other than Westcott. The saying was to the effect that he was "*more certain of the Resurrection than of any other fact*". As I stood shivering at that wash-basin with cold water coming out of the hot tap, ice on the windows, razor cuts on my face, I wondered: here were stark realities—facts if any were—blood, cold water, ice . . . certain as any-

[1] Thomas Sherlock, The Tryal of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus (1729) (*Religious Thought in the Eighteenth Century*. J. M. Creed and J. S. Boys Smith. 1934. Pp. 72, 73).

thing could be . . . "matters of fact and objects of sense". . . . But has the Resurrection *that* kind of certainty?

What I propose to do in this article is, first, to show by reference to the Resurrection narrative that belief in the Resurrection is *something more* than belief in a matter of fact; thereafter to mention one or two implications of this view; and last of all to return to Paton's criticism. Let us begin then by turning to the Resurrection narratives to see there what belief in the Resurrection involves, and let us look first at the Emmaus story.

Here were the two disciples puzzled, sad, disappointed—and they "communed and questioned together". As they shared this fellowship of questioning, this discussion, this exchange of points, this engagement, "Jesus himself"—the risen Lord—"drew near and went with them". They saw the risen Jesus, as we might see any other companion on a walk, but, we read, "their eyes were holden that they should not know him". We need not read into that verse any divine teleology; at the same time let us notice that it was not their reasoning, rather was it their eyes, their vision, that was restrained, restricted, held in check, held back, so that in fact they did not know him. Their lack was not a correct interpretation or adequate categorical scheme, but rather a full discernment, a deeper vision—the penny hadn't dropped, the ice hadn't broken. However, within their fellowship of questioning, further points are developed, and by Jesus himself: "Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures, the things concerning himself." We are told afterwards that at this point their hearts "burned within them", but I suggest that we take the word καίω as rather implying that at this point their hearts had just been *ignited, lit,* as a torch. . . . And it was a torch that only flared, only gave full illumination . . . when? The full disclosure was made, they *knew* the risen Christ in the fellowship of a village supper-table; in the intimacy of a home. Stranger . . . Teacher . . . Interpreter . . . Friend . . . and then . . . the Risen Christ. . . . But at this point, the point of full disclosure, "*he became invisible*". To know the risen Christ was an empirical fact—something which was incontrovertibly the case, but *not* as an "object of sense". . . . Here was a situation epistemologically odd, as odd indeed as the word ἄφαντος. In the Bible it occurs only once besides here, and then of angels becoming invisible: and in Classical Greek I understand the word has only a poetical use—which for us means that the word has an ancestry which is nothing if not logically odd. In short, the risen Christ became "invisible", but he was still there and known—but "there" oddly, and "known" oddly—odd from the point of view of "objects of sense". It was not like coming to know that this stranger in plus fours dining at the club is in fact Archbishop Makarios in disguise, cause for gratification and smoking-room excitement. Rather was there here a recognition distinctly odd. It was one which restored to the disciples vitality and commitment they had lost; they were not merely gratified: they were empowered. They "rose up that very

hour" and went to Jerusalem as *witnesses of the Resurrection*, a fact they knew now in its fullness, and they knew it in this fullness, notice, when he "vanished out of their sight", though not out of their loyalty. . . . There had been a fellowship of questioning, an exchange of points illuminated by Bible study, but all these were preliminaries to something else, to that full disclosure which came in a situation more than "objects of sense", and which came in such a way that we speak of it as a disclosure given by the initiative of God. Not only had the Scriptures been "opened", but their eyes had been "opened", and if the word be taken in its wider context, both had been "opened", as a womb, to be creative of new life, new duties, a richer existence.

But, you might say, does this not come dangerously near to making Resurrection belief entirely independent of "objects of sense"—and if we had nothing but the Emmaus story that challenge might be serious. So we pass now to what, on the face of it, is the other extreme—St Thomas. We *need* Thomas. Here is the plain, down-to-earth empiricist. "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails [tactual as well as visual verification is needed] I will not believe." There is then the invitation—"see my hands", "reach hither thy finger" . . . and Thomas who has *seen, believes*. Is his Resurrection-belief, then, belief in a matter of fact, objects of sight and touch? If St Thomas had said, "I admit it's Jesus after all", or "I'm assured; I'm prepared to witness in a court of law, at a 'Tryal of Witnesses', that it is the same body", that might have been our conclusion. But when St Thomas is assured, his language goes beyond perceptual or legal language. He confesses: "My Lord and my God." Here is a commitment which goes beyond what is seen; a witnessing which is more than trials and law courts take account of. Thomas sees . . . but not only perceptual objects. He believes in the Resurrection as an "object of sense" and more.

But you may puzzle—an "object of sense" and more? How can that be? We might anticipate the answer by recalling that Resurrection assurance came in the friendly intimacy of a homely meal . . . but for the fullest answer let us go to our third and last example: Mary Magdalene. For Mary, Jesus was not some great teacher or national figure—he was someone who had changed her life. She wasn't perplexed by the political or theological implications of it all like the disciples on the road to Emmaus, nor did she formulate empirical doubts like St Thomas—what mattered was that she had lost a friend, and all she could do was to go to where there was still a reminder of him—the tomb where his body lay. How powerful a symbol of friendship the human body can be! Then, not even satisfaction at the tomb . . . no body . . . no relevant "matter of fact", nor "object of sense". Then, as much as the two disciples or Thomas, she starts asking questions, seeking explanations. "They", perhaps the Jews, perhaps the gardener, must have taken away the Lord's body . . . and it is in this mood of explanation-seeking that she says to someone she takes to be the gardener: "Tell me where you've

put him; I'll take the body and care for it." Here is a situation, here is thinking, so much concerned with "objects of sense", such as bodies, as to merit no more than the descriptive phrase "the gardener". . . . Do you remember how in the *Patris*, in his native country, when Jesus was rejected by those who a little while before had been astonished by his preaching and marvelled at his mighty works; do you remember how, with the rejection, came descriptive phrases "the carpenter", "the son of Mary", "brother of James"? So, likewise, "the gardener" . . . when there is no disclosure.

Then, the situation "comes alive", takes on "depth", loses its impersonal "official" character . . . the risen Christ discloses himself and only an intimate greeting is appropriate currency: "Mary". . . . The Resurrection cannot be netted in the language of definite descriptions. The logical difference between "Mary" and "the gardener" tells how much *more* the Resurrection *is* than an "object of sense". Here then is our special point arising from the story of Mary Magdalene: the Resurrection is a situation which is a matter of fact *and more*, an "object of sense" *and more*, precisely as the most intimate personal interchange is all that, too. Further, just as to human love we respond with a full devotion—so Mary's response is not "Teacher" —how limited a portrayal that word gives—but rather "My Master, Lord, chief, prince" . . . almost the same language as St Thomas . . . words which are currency for a *full* loyalty, to tell *now* of the same *full* commitment she had known before in Jesus. *Here is Resurrection-belief, a total response to something which touches us personally*. Perhaps after all in gracing a wash-basin mirror in the Victorian vicarage the bishop's assertion was more significant than we realized. Freezing water, shaving soap, blood—these may be facts, i.e. "objects of sense"—but of none of them was I so certain as (looking into the mirror) of another "fact", an "object of sense" and more, "myself"—that "I'm I", a conviction which in so far as it goes beyond perceptual "matters of fact" affords something of a parallel with our assurance of the risen Christ. Further, in so far as the bishop's extreme language was trying to emphasize the *all-embracing* significance of Resurrection-belief, the *total* commitment the Resurrection evokes, we might say that his chief fault was to express a most important point in the most misleading language possible; which is what so often we Christians have done. The Christian witness cannot be expressed in logically straightforward language without doing itself injustice and digging its own grave; and we ought to say "boo" to the geese of various kinds which could tempt us to try. But to come back. We must indeed distinguish in relation to the Resurrection:

(*a*) First the "matters of fact" which are "objects of sense" and about which empirical questions can be asked; which legal witnesses talk of, on which historical discussion can be centred, for which verification can be sought.

(*b*) Then, the situation which is such "matters of fact" *and more*— a situation which is empirically odd, and one to which we have a clue in some personal situations. To know what "Resurrection" means, demands such a fuller discernment. If in this life only we have hoped

in Christ; if Christ is for us exhausted in perceptual terms; if the risen Christ is no more than a matter of fact which is an "object of sense", then we are of all men most pitiable.

(*c*) Finally, such a fuller discernment which embraces "objects of sense" and more, evokes and is fulfilled in a response, a commitment, in virtue of which we become, by our response, Christian "witnesses of the Resurrection"—"obedient to our heavenly vision".

Just a few points now by way of illustration and conclusion: and the first to show how easy it has been for Christians, as well as their opponents, to mistake the logic of what they were saying, and they fail to do justice to the logical complexity of their contentions.

We have urged that the Resurrection narratives do not so much record "facts", tell of "objects of sense", as evoke situations, situations of discernment-response for which we have parallels in the devotion we give to those whose love we return. Now that discernment which is centred on Jesus is called by us Christians "eternal life in Christ Jesus", and it is against such a background as this that we must understand such ostensibly simple phrases, e.g. as that Jesus Christ "opened unto us the gate of everlasting life".

But if all that is the case, then not only does "Resurrection" exceed all "objects of sense", but "immortality" and "eternal life" are no logical kinsman, and (*pace* Dr C. D. Broad) Christ is no term in an argument for immortality from analogy, but rather a focus for Resurrection-vision and devotion.

So we can see how logically skew and cross-purposed are such objections as are commonly raised: if Jesus opens the gate of everlasting life to Christians, do only Christians survive? Can Christians argue that we are immortal because Jesus is immortal, when what is so obvious is that Jesus is utterly different from us? How easy to get off on the wrong logical foot—and for Christians it can be as easy as for their opponents. Did not A. A. Sykes, in 1740, declare that the Resurrection was an "argument for immortality from eyesight", displaying the proposition that we are immortal in such large empirical letters that even the least philosophical could read and understand. Resurrection, for Sykes, was a plain "object of sense"; "immortality" was a kinsman of "eternal life".

Eschewing such over-simplification as leads only to puzzles and needless difficulties, we have stressed the logical peculiarity of the Resurrection. Was there an empty tomb? Did Jesus eat fish? Did the Resurrection occur? All these seem plain isomorphous questions, questions of the same form about "matters of fact". But recall $\frac{2}{3}$, $\frac{3}{4}$, $\frac{0}{0}$. All *seem* to belong to the same logical family, but what of the last? An ugly duckling indeed. Similarly, we have pleaded the logical peculiarity of Resurrection: that the situation on which the Christian faith is based is nothing if not odd: another ugly duckling! What "Resurrection" stands for includes but transcends "empty tomb" and "eating fish" as much as "loving" includes but transcends "meeting", as "devotion" is more than "efficient support", as "I" tells of more than public behaviour exhausts.

What now of Paton's criticism? Are we cheating in our witness?

Does there not still remain a gap, a logical gap between, on the one side, the phrases in terms of which the Christian faith is *preached*, and on the other side, that clear unambiguous language which stands for "objects of sense"? Is there not a gap between the swans and the ducks? Certainly there is a gap; indeed, the whole concern of this article has been to expose the gap for what it is. But we would only be cheats if we could do nothing, or would do nothing, about bridging the gap. We should, for example, be cheating if once we had distinguished between the "Resurrection" with its peculiar logical status, and "matters of fact" about which ordinary questions of evidence can be asked, we said that the "matter of fact" assertions did not matter. At its most naïve this cheat would be a prejudice against theology such as was expressed in the old revivalist ditty: "The Religion of Paul and Silas is good enough for me." At its more sophisticated, it could show itself in a desire to take the Scriptural narratives so symbolically that it does not matter whether the stories are fiction, fable or fancy.

But in emphasizing the distinctive character of the Christian belief in the Resurrection, it has been no part of my purpose to deny its essential reference to "objects of sense" as well. Indeed, on the contrary, I have tried to give a hint about how the two points can be combined, about how the logical gap can be bridged. The hint comes from recognizing what has likewise to be both distinguished and related in situations of human love and devotion. For here, too, there are "objects of sense" and more. Characteristically personal behaviour is more than "what's seen"; or, if it is not, religious people are cheats indeed. We shall be helped to meet Paton's criticism if we concentrate on this personal model, and in particular if we develop the theme that while of course all personal loyalty is anchored in some facts of an empirical kind, personal devotion never builds on empirical fact with a nicely calculated less or more. In this way "personal devotion" can be a logical paradigm by which to understand "Resurrection witness".

I. T. Ramsey.

A Case for Exorcism in Baptism

Not the least of the merits of Archbishop Cranmer's work on the Prayer Book was that in the Baptismal Office he attempted to give us a rite which was suited to the particular needs of infant baptism. The significance of this achievement may be judged by the fact that nothing of the kind had happened in Europe since the Church of Rome had steam-rollered the realistic endeavours of the Gallican Church at the beginning of the ninth century. Right up to the Reformation the service which prevailed throughout Western Christendom had retained all those rites and ceremonies which had properly and suitably belonged to the preparation of an adult candidate. The making of a catechumen and the business of the scrutinies were all solemnly performed over the infant candidate for baptism, until

the archbishop swept them away in 1549 to clear the way for a fresh start: an exorcism was one of the few things that survived until 1552.

The suggestion that an exorcism, accompanied by its appropriate action, should be introduced again into the rite in the twentieth century may at first seem to be too extravagant to be taken seriously. It will be said that people nowadays do not believe in the devil: exorcism would be incongruous in the present state of the public mind: and similar difficulties would be raised. There is no need to go over the well-trodden ground of argument, whether there is a devil or not. It is sufficient for our purposes to observe that no further intellectual difficulty would be created by the introduction of exorcism than the rite already contains in the Renunciation. And if some people to-day find it possible and necessary to regard the Renunciation as dealing with an abstraction rather than with a reality, there is no reason why they should not also perform an exorcism, with the same reservation and with single-minded vigour.

If, in spite of these difficulties, we find it possible to take the suggestion seriously, we shall find that it offers certain attractive advantages.

1. The appeal to the simple mind. Actions always speak louder than words, and particularly to the majority of the people to whom the Church ministers and always has ministered. The clear and purposeful manner of an exorcism would make an impression upon most people far more profound than the mass of unintelligible verbiage which the present rite owes to continental sources at the Reformation, or the insipid statements of more recent contributions. We are constantly being reminded of the need for simplicity in the rite. The need for something vivid and dramatic is no less: and the liturgy of the Church has nothing more simple or more vivid to offer than its exorcisms.

2. Exorcism not only tells a clear story effectively: it tells a story which needs to be told. The transference of the candidate from the realm of darkness to the kingdom of light is an integral part of baptism. Yet, while there is no pastoral difficulty in explaining that the child is being brought *into the Church* at baptism, it is not at all so easy to explain how also it is being *delivered from and taken out of* something. An exorcism of the devil at the beginning of the rite would thus solve a real pastoral difficulty: it would show in the clearest possible way that the child is delivered from the realm of the devil and taken into Christ. Liturgically speaking, the rite might thus come to exhibit three points—Exorcism, the expulsion of the devil; the Gospel, announcing God's good will; Baptism, accepting God's good will—which would provide it with a didactic power far more effective than the didacticism of continental exhortations.

3. The exorcist. Endeavours are being made to-day to administer Holy Baptism with the splendour and dignity which is due to a Dominical sacrament. An effective place for the ministrations of a second minister in the rite would help this process. Exorcists were anciently people in minor orders, and when the order disappeared, their function at Rome was taken over by acolytes. Is there any

reason why exorcism should not be added to the duties of lay readers? At the present time the Canons of 1604 present a legal obstacle to this, since Canon 72 forbids the parish priest "by fasting and prayer to cast out any devil or devils" without episcopal permission. Nevertheless, if exorcism were to be restored to the regular liturgy of the Church, it seems worth while to consider whether it should not also be restored to the minor orders, who anciently performed it.

The manual acts remain to be considered. Ancient custom offers three possibilities: the imposition of a hand, the sign of the cross, and exsufflation (which of course is not strictly a manual act). The last seems preferable, in so far as it is more dramatic. The significance of exsufflation is well set out in the following quotations. A rubric in the Ambrosian Manual reads: *Exsuffla a pede ad caput, ad deridendum diabolum.* In the same vein, John the Deacon writes: *Exsufflatur itaque, quia tali dignus est ignominia antiquus desertor.* And in the Byzantine rite we read:

Priest: Have ye renounced Satan?
Candidates: We have renounced.
Priest: Then blow upon him.

Such was the spirit in which exsufflation was administered. It has the merit of providing something of the drama which we need, and if it were carried out, not into the mouth as in some rites, but in the Milanese manner described above, it could not be open to the twentieth-century objection that it was unhygienic.

E. C. Whitaker.

Preaching Heaven

SOME HINTS FROM JOHN VENN OF CLAPHAM

E. M. Forster in his recent biography of Marianne Thornton describes the atmosphere of the home at Clapham into which she was born: "Affections, comfort, piety, integrity, intelligence, public activity, private benevolence: and transcending them all an unshaken belief in a future life where the members of the household would meet again and would recognize each other and be happy eternally. It is this belief that makes the 'Clapham Sect' seem remote to-day, even to Christians. Personal immortality to-day may not be denied by orthodoxy, but it is played down, it is felt to be self-centred and anti-social, it is seldom conceived as a changeless background of family life as it was at Battersea Rise. Our hopes of continuance, when we entertain them, are arguably more spiritual. Then they were a solid possession, to be maintained by prayers, self-questionings, and good deeds, and to be confirmed finally through the mercy of God."[1]

Whatever one makes of this theological appraisal, the "playing down" to-day of the doctrine of the future life cannot be denied. The B.B.C. discovered that, over a five-year period in the forties, no

[1] E. M. Forster, *Marianne Thornton*, p. 29.

sermon had been broadcast on the subject of the future life. In view of this, the discovery of Mass Observation in 1947 that 46 per cent of their Church of England sample disbelieve in life after death is not surprising. Of course there are good reasons for neglect of this doctrine: the reaction against an otherworldliness that was often escapist and sometimes hypocritical, the stress in modern theology on the essential "nowness" of the New Testament message and, not least, the distaste that a scientific age feels for much of the traditional celestial imagery. In view of the lushness and mawkishness of many hymns we sympathize with Barth's reminder that we are not going to "an eternal Hallelujah singing".[1] If we are to recover for our preaching and our people something of the atmosphere and the reality of a true otherworldliness we may find help in the preaching of John Venn, the chaplain of the Clapham Sect.

John Venn, son of Henry Venn of Huddersfield, was rector of Clapham from 1793 till his death in 1813. He is generally remembered as the first chairman of the Church Missionary Society, but he was also one of the originators of the *Christian Observer* and an authority on education. At Clapham his church, which held 1,400 people, was usually full and an extra beadle had to be employed to superintend the parking of carriages. He not only increased the number of services, but revived sacramental life and a respect for the Christian Year. When well, he practised house-to-house visiting in order to inquire into his parishioners' state and to furnish them with Bibles and Prayer Books where wanted. Before his death he claimed that every child could be taught to read and write gratuitously, that every family could be supplied with a Bible, and that every inhabitant could find accommodation to worship God. The poor and destitute, many of whom came to church, were looked after by an efficient voluntary society, of which he was both originator and treasurer. To defend Clapham against Napoleon he formed the Clapham Armed Association, of which he was chaplain.

In Venn's preaching the themes of Easter, Ascension and All Saints-tide are treated with great imaginative eloquence, so much so that after his death a former curate spoke of "that spirituality and heavenlimindedness which made (Venn) occasionally speak of heaven almost as if he had been there".[2] What then was the content of this preaching? What did Venn say of the nature of heaven itself? In what relation did he view heaven and earth? What importance did he attach to this world and what is done in this world? How did he lead his congregation to desire to be heavenliminded and give the things of eternity their proper preference over the things of time?

When speaking of heaven itself Venn refuses to press the details of Scripture literally; he says, "Of the nature of heaven, we do not know much". All that the Bible gives are "general descriptions, suited to convince us that it is a happy and glorious place, rather than to inform us in what particulars the happiness and glory of it consist".[3]

[1] Barth and Thurneysen, *God's Search for Man*, p. 193.
[2] J. Venn, *Sermons*, Vol. I, Preface, p. xvi. [3] Ibid., II, 247.

Yet by use of powerful contrasts and the exploration of Scriptural imagery he is able to suggest something of that glory and that happiness. In one sermon he contrasts the "external grandeur" which earthly kings accumulate to distinguish themselves from their subjects with the glory that God delights in sharing with his people "grace for grace, glory for glory, bliss for bliss. Because he lives they shall live also. Because he reigns they shall reign also. . . . He rejoices to impart his own resemblance to them. . . . The splendour of his kingdom consists of the splendour of his subjects, and in the profusion of that bounty from which their splendour is derived."[1] Again by careful contrasts he is able to speak of the happiness of heaven. Like his friend John Newton in "Glorious things of thee are spoken", and like C. S. Lewis in *The Great Divorce*, it is the solidity of heavenly joys that he praises. In a sermon on "The State of the Saints Above", he speaks of heaven, "where all things are as substantial as here they are vain; where all things are as momentous as here they are frivolous; where all things are as great as here they are little; where all things are as durable as here they are transitory; where all things are as fixed as here they are mutable".[2] Here is surely something that could well be stressed in the sermon of to-day. Solidity, reliability, genuineness, these are the marks of heaven. In heaven there is no cheating, no false values and all the pettiness of this world will be dissolved and all its exclusiveness done away. To quote Venn again: "There it will be no cause of jealousy, or rivalry, or hatred, that one man received his birth on this, and another on that side of a river or sea. A man will not despise his brother on account of the different shade of his complexion: he will not seek his destruction because he spoke in another language, nor renounce communion with him because he praised the same God with the same spirit of piety in a house of a different form. All these petty distinctions will either have ceased to exist or will be completely annihilated in the general spirit of love which will then animate every mind. One pursuit will occupy every heart; each will strive only to glorify God. There will either be no distinctions, or the distinctions will be like the variety we see in the works of God—like flowers enriched with different colours to delight the eye, or with various perfumes to gratify the smell. . . . In heaven . . . no odious denominations will parcel out the regenerated church, no frivolous distinctions be suffered to break the unity of the members of Christ: but people of every nation and kindred and tribe and tongue will unite in one worship, will be animated with one spirit, will be actuated by one principle, and that the principle of pure and universal love."[3] These words originally gave heart to the men who abolished the Slave Trade, founded the Church Missionary Society, and served as the first officers of the interdenominational British and Foreign Bible Society. They speak home, I believe, no less to us with our ardent desire for the abolition of racial discrimination and for the reunion of the Church.

[1] Venn, *Sermons*, III, 171 f. [2] Ibid., I, 85. [3] Ibid., I, 88–9.

In yet another sermon Venn declares that in heaven opportunity is subject to neither frustration nor limitation. "There we have not to dread a violent termination to good and great design—a sudden extinction of knowledge acquired and digested with anxiety and labour."[1] In heaven there is scope "for infinite enlargement and perfection; for boundless good and immeasurable glory".[2] This removal of restraint, he maintains, is what makes for heaven without end on the one hand and hell without end on the other.[3] This is indeed true freedom when all handicaps, all limitations, are removed and the possibility of sin no longer exists. This idea may be expanded, for is it not true that on earth we are prevented from doing things because we are too young or too old, because we are not well enough, because we are too poor or too rich, or because we do not possess the necessary knowledge? But in heaven the limitations of health, age and education will be removed. Surely this is God-given cordial for this "age of anxiety" with its inferiority complexes and nervous breakdowns and the general homelessness of its people. Here together with the joyful termination of all exclusiveness is a Gospel indeed. As in heaven so on earth. Here is a way of helping our congregations to live "sub specie aeternetatis".

I have left little time to discuss the importance that Venn attached to this world and what is done in this world, but I could give further quotations to show that there is nothing escapist about Venn's otherworldliness. His religion was a seven-day-a-week religion affecting every corner of life. For Venn contemplation of heaven did not lead away from the world but into it. Nor was he world-renouncing in his attitude to the natural order. He says, "Yours is the world, who use it for those ends for which its gracious Creator formed it: who survey its delightful scenery, its mountains, its valleys, its rivers, and feel that they are yours because they were made by him who is your Father. . . . The world is yours to enjoy it with moderation, thankful for the convenience it affords you while a pilgrim and a stranger in it, on your way to a better and heavenly country."[4] Otherworldliness, he believed, begets the right attitude to nature and also to the trials of suffering and disappointment. "A worldly frame of mind is fitted to feel trouble and affliction keenly and bitterly; heavenlimindedness teaches us to use the world without overvaluing it; to enjoy its lawful pleasures, yet not unduly to grieve for their loss. And if ever religion fails ultimately to produce cheerfulness . . . it is because it has not yet produced a lively and cheering hope of immortality."[5] In fact, otherworldliness produces true detachment and victory over the sins of materialism.

Venn returns to this theme in his exposition of the Epistle for Easter Day. "Set your affections on things above, not on the things of the earth." The text, he says, "forbids us to set our affection upon the things on the earth. We are not to make these our chief pursuit; to seek them with our utmost eagerness; to be inordinately elated

[1] Venn, *Sermons*, III, 177. [2] Ibid., II, 256. [3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid., III, 193. [5] Ibid., II, 209–10.

when we are successful in obtaining them, and exceedingly depressed when we lose them."[1] John Venn continually suggests that the key to this heavenlimindedness lies in a disciplining of the desires and affections. He is concerned for those of his people who "enjoy no more the pleasures of piety than the pleasures of profaneness".[2] He states, "Everything is tedious in which the heart is not engaged; everything delightful in which it is interested."[3] When the heart has truly become engaged in devotion and love to God the objects which used to hold its affections "will be found to be in their own nature vain and unsatisfactory, perpetually exciting and perpetually disappointing expectation, difficult to be possessed, and when possessed, failing and transitory in their enjoyment. Hence by degrees the affections will be weaned from worldly things and fixed upon higher and better objects. Love to God will now begin to direct and sweeten every religious service. What was before done only from a sense of duty will now be performed with the full and free choice of the heart."[4] The expulsive power of a new affection will make victory over temptation easier, "for where the mind is much occupied about divine things the tempter will meet with little encouragement".[5] Professor Dodd, employing the terms of modern psychology, seems to say much the same in his comments on Romans, chapter 6, where he speaks of the growth of personality as "a process of replacing bad sentiments by more worthy ones", and applies it to the new self in Christ.[6]

Without making any claim that in Venn's sermons there is a coherent theology of the life everlasting, yet it can be said that he does provide for the preacher clues still worth pursuing, even though much that he and his hearers took for granted is now regarded differently.

MICHAEL HENNELL.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. P. K. Dagadu is a Methodist minister and the secretary of the Christian Council of Ghana.

The Rev. I. T. Ramsey is Nolloth Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion in the University of Oxford and a Fellow of Oriel College.

The Rev. E. C. Whitaker is Vicar of Kirkby-in-Furness, Lancs.

The Rev. Michael Hennell is Vice-Principal of St Aidan's College, Birkenhead.

We regret that we made a mistake last month in saying that the Rev. A. P. Leary is a Librarian of Pusey House.

---

[1] Venn, *Sermons*, III, 286. [2] Ibid., II, 259. [3] Ibid., III, 216. [4] Ibid., III, 215. [5] Ibid., II, 275 f. [6] C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle to the Romans*, pp. 90 f.

CORRESPONDENCE

"THE NATIONAL CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL ORDER"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

To those of your readers who have not read the recent Report on *The National Church and the Social Order*, Mr Munby's long criticism of its economic bearings might appear to be as damaging as he evidently thinks it is. I shall therefore be grateful if you will allow me space for a comparatively brief rejoinder. I write without the knowledge or authority of the Social and Industrial Council which sponsored the work after deputing me to write it; but I have taken counsel with the chairman and with those members of the working party concerned with its production who gave most attention to the parts of it that Mr Munby castigates, and what I say has their general agreement.

More important than his specific criticism of passages that he quotes is the point of view from which Mr Munby attacks them. Throughout his article, especially in its first and last pages, he evidently accords to economic opinion an authority in Christian social thinking which we cannot concede. That the Christian citizen "must inform himself on economic matters", as the Archbishops' Committee urged in 1918, does not mean that he must take his cue from whatever school of economic thought is dominant at the time. It was, indeed, the authority of scientific truth claimed by the early economists that intimidated Christian social thinking during the worst period of the building-up of the industrial towns under notoriously inhuman conditions. It produced the economic fatalism against which Shaftesbury, G. S. Bull, Oastler and the few Christian Owenites had to fight for elementary human rights and which many churchmen of their day—clerical and lay—refused to accept. It was this which caused the bitterness of the factory campaign of the 1830s and the anti-Poor Law agitation of 1834–7. That experience has been a lesson that churchmen, we hope and believe, will not easily unlearn—a lesson of the danger of conceding the claims of a social science to prescribe a framework within which Christian social thinking is to operate.

I expect Mr Munby would disown such a claim, but if more than a little of it were not implicit in his attitude, why should he assume that the economic part of the Church social tradition that he decries is based on "ignorance" and motivated by "arrogance". Over-confidence of this prompts him to attack on points that are more marginal than they look and inclines him to mistake contradiction for refutation; most of his objections are poorly substantiated. Indeed, at the first five sentences of ours that he pillories (on p. 93a) he thinks it sufficient to "raise his eyebrows", an argument I confess I am at a loss to meet. For the few remarks that follow this superciliary gesture are vague and unspecific; the sentences he quarrels with still seem to us quite sound in their context.

The same prejudice causes him to make a very weakly sustained attack upon three sentences in which we alluded incidentally to the ups and downs of prosperity in the later nineteenth century (p. 93b). The facts and figures he quotes supplement our allusions without invalidating any of them so far as we can see; at the most, they do no more than show our ignorance of some recent documents that only a specialist is likely to have read. Similarly, from our account of the eighteenth century, he quotes two sentences (p. 94c) and contrasts them with quotations from good economic historians. But the latter only show that our statement is to be understood in the context of a *general* increase of wealth, despite the growing division into the "two nations"; while what we said about the Bank of England is actually confirmed by the quotation from Clapham, unless we are assumed to have supposed that the whole of the national credit came under the control of the central bank simultaneously in 1694. Similarly, our allusion to the fact that the State's prerogative in finance was "signalized" by the nationalization of the bank after the last war is quoted (p. 98f) as though it convicted us of a good deal more ignorance of the history of that institution than the remark proves—or than (with all modesty) we possessed.

A "misunderstanding of the function of money" is alleged on the evidence of a paragraph quoted (p. 96) from our section on the usury controversies. This is simply a statement of what the canonist lawyers said: we deal also with some of the other things they said, such as their justification of interest in certain circumstances. I can hardly believe that Mr Munby thinks that the point about "liquid preference" which he cites as "modern" was unknown to the canonist lawyers, yet he clearly excuses them for "ignorance" of it. Lord Keynes had a higher opinion of their knowledge when he wrote:

> "I now read these [the canonists'] discussions as an honest intellectual effort to keep separate what the classical theory has inextricably confused together, namely, the rate of interest and the marginal efficiency of capital. For it now seems clear that the disquisitions of the schoolmen were directed towards the elucidation of a formula which should allow the schedule of the marginal efficiency of capital to be high, whilst using rule and custom and the moral law to keep down the rate of interest."[1]

To turn to a contemporary issue on which Mr Munby assails our judgment—the over-exploitation of economic resources: our critic betrays the velleity still typical of the urban bias of economic opinion. The danger we described is only beginning to be at all effectively realized. For instance, it is only since the last war that the Canadian newsprint industry, enriched by a great windfall of profit, has begun to re-afforest the lands it had previously denuded of trees. I wonder if Mr Munby knows the Webbs' book on *The Decay of Capitalist Civilization*, which is full of evidences of the "buccaneering disregard of consequences" to which we referred? And there is plenty of more recent documentation.

But you will not want me, sir to take up space by dealing with all

[1] J. M. Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, p. 352.

of your contributor's points. Some he admits to be debateable (p. 95); upon others (e.g. pp. 98g, 99h) he frankly begs the question at issue. But I must say something about his annoyance at our attempt to indicate what economics *was* (not what its nature *is*) in the period when it first became publicly influential, for ill as well as good (p. 96b). No doubt this statement, like many others in our work, could be refined and improved, but there is nothing gravely misleading in it; and it is surely hypercritical to condemn our suspicion of a self-regarding element in the economists' neglect of relevant ethical factors, at a time when they had every excuse for feeling "on top of the world", as "a cheap sneer". Mr Munby himself, writing elsewhere about the price mechanism, has said, we think rightly, that

> ". . . economists have been tempted to fall down and worship this marvellous automatic regulator of man's affairs, partly at least because they alone understand it, and what we understand we begin to love, and then to adore."[1]

It has rather surprised us that one of the younger economists should attack with such animus a piece of work with which he ought to have so little real quarrel. Partly, I think, it is because the inter-war years were before his time; he has no experience of what the economic atmosphere was like before the learned faculty admitted that savings did not equal investments, and that demand does not necessarily look after itself. He cannot believe what we say about the state of responsible financial and industrial opinion at that time (p. 97d), and here we would refer him, for instance, to the F.B.I. Memorandum reported in *The Times* of 10 February 1923. This statement flatly contradicted the Convocation of Canterbury's Committee which had pronounced the proper maintenance of the labourer to be "a first charge on industry", it asserted that "the real and ultimate test must always be what industry can bear" and insisted that the workers must be "prepared to accept . . . till trade revives . . . a lower standard of living . . . even than their pre-war standard". On such assumptions the economic system was organized; we were not defending them as economically necessary, nor denying the idea that Mr Munby expresses about the possibility of income-distribution—but nobody in authority entertained it then.

Another reason is that the academic economist has the disadvantage as well as the advantage of being able to keep himself unspotted from the forum and market-place where economic troubles generate amateur (and sometimes uncouth) movements of spontaneous criticism and theory; never so many as in the 'twenties and 'thirties. Thus, of social credit theories Mr Munby can only see the "incredible stupidity" (p. 98e) into which indeed a good many of their epigoni did decline; whereas Keynes, who was in the thick of the fray, did not care to deny Douglas a place in—

> ". . . the brave army of heretics—with Mandeville, Malthus, Gesell and Hobson who, following their intuitions, have preferred to see the truth obscurely and imperfectly rather than to maintain error, reached indeed with clearness and consistency and by easy logic, but on hypotheses inappropriate to the facts."[2]

[1] D. L. Munby, *Christianity and Economic Problems*, p. 205.
[2] Op. cit., p. 371.

More regrettable is Mr Munby's declaration that "no Christian social writers, nor any advocate of social credit, made any contribution to (Keynes's) *explanation*" of unemployment. There speaks your academic, so ready to think the formula is everything, and to ignore all the work of educational persuasion that has to be done before it will find acceptance as a principle of action. (I do not, of course, suggest for a moment that Mr Munby, the author of a voluminous survey of industry and planning in Stepney, can be thought of as *only* a theorist.) But the general improvement since that time in economic information, and in the attitude to it, is something of which he evidently has little idea; or he would not write as he does of the Christian social writers and speakers during this period of economic and political bewilderment, of which we have a good deal to say in our Report. Their contribution to the social-economic awareness of the time was very considerable.

It is a matter for regret, I think, that limitations of time and space made it impossible for us to survey and to illustrate the advance, from a Christian humanist standpoint, between the times of Bentham and Ricardo and those of Marshall and Keynes. We began to collect material, but the task had to be abandoned. Rather than excuse ourselves, however, we offer regrets for the grievance, in this sense legitimate, which Mr Munby may feel as a Christian who is an economist, though he has reacted by finding fault with what we did say, and not by calling attention to our omission. He has been led to assume that we have a "down" on economic science and a studied disrespect for its practitioners, which would indeed be absurd. None of the social sciences is so highly developed, so necessary to the ordering of modern life or in less danger of disparagement, though the issues with which it has to deal are the most publicly controversial. But it is also in constant danger from the introverted specialization against which it is a special concern of the Christian to keep all scientists on the alert. On this our critic needs no instruction from us. Let me end by saying that, in any difference of opinion about the social and ethical approach to a contemporary economic problem, we should much prefer to have the support of Mr Munby's professional competence. And it is a satisfaction to me to think, after a first reading of his *Christianity and Economic Problems*, that in such disputes he would generally find himself on our side.

Yours faithfully,
PHILIP MAIRET.

BIBLE READING IN A BUSY LIFE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

At the risk of universal execration may I offer some reflections on Mrs Parker's delightfully candid article on the above in the March issue of THEOLOGY?

My personal experience in the matter has been as full of difficulty

and frustration as her own. Passing through school days in almost total ignorance of the Old Testament or its meaning, my devotion to the Gospels was kindled by a study of the Greek text with special reference to the moral problems posed by our Lord's teaching. The stimulus was of course due to the passionate interest of our form master, himself a young and able classicist, and a Christian. All this, however, was killed outright by the detached and highly analytical study of the Bible for the purposes of university examinations. The Bible became a dead book, a mere mine of references. The return to it was by way of the great mystics. I formed the habit of reading two or three pages of some spiritual writer every morning and evening with my prayers, a habit I have continued ever since. But as one read in a slow and leisurely fashion, one found oneself virtually reading the Bible, though in a quite new and exciting, albeit fragmentary, way. The mystery of union with God, corporately and individually, was expounded from the angle of personal experience in the light of the whole biblical revelation, interpreted admittedly in the case of the Old Testament with sometimes far-fetched allegorization, but always with utter reverence. A single biblical phrase was frequently enough to bring forth two or three pages of rich explanatory comment from the deep mine of the writer's own contemplative experience.

The effect of this slow contemplative reading was to give one a sense of the preciousness of the liturgical lessons one never had before. Having seen a very ordinary phrase, hitherto passed over unnoticed, used by such writers to light up some tract of spiritual experience, one began to read the dreariest historical passages with a new fascination and sensitivity—rather like a man traversing a barren beach with a mine detector, having one eye on the surface text and the other looking below for those sentences and phrases which had meant so much in one's spiritual reading. One soon realized that if only one's spiritual perception and experience of life were fine enough and rich enough the whole Bible might come to life in the same way as these detached phrases.

Yet despite this I confess I am still incapable of reading the Bible devotionally outside the Daily Offices. I cannot meditate on the Bible—a habit Westcott appears to have described as "thinking by machinery"—except through the medium of the great spiritual writers. The nearest approach to the fascination I find with the Bible by this means is through the study of it in the preparation for sermons, study groups, and the like. But the attempt to read it devotionally in one's study is ruined by the demon of familiarity encountered by Mrs Parker. The words are so familiar for whole sentences ahead that they slip past the mind like an incantation before it has had time to savour them.

The experience of a brief thirteen years as a priest therefore inclines me to think that, were I now a layman, my system of Bible reading would follow the scheme of the liturgical lessons of the Daily Offices, since sitting under God with the church in this way has the effect of delivering one from that sense of self-distrust or aimlessness

which sometimes attends purely self-chosen Bible study. The daily fare might consist of an Old Testament lesson in the morning and a New Testament lesson in the evening; or one or both in the evening if a morning session proved impossible, supplemented by ten minutes' spiritual reading. Fascination with the minutiae of the biblical text is the secret of its power to fire the mind and move the will, and spiritual reading gives this, providing us, incidentally, with the odd phrase to carry around through the day, renewing us in knowledge. Bible reading, spiritual reading, prayer and life then tie up in a rich meaningful cycle; reading producing the fervour of love to offer in one's prayer, this in turn producing the vital energy of grace for the strains of life.

I have ignored the problem of the academic study of the Bible because I feel that for the average layman, not involved in teaching, one big commentary, such as Gore's, faithfully used, will provide all the basic knowledge necessary.

Yours faithfully,
J. K. Byrom.

Cheadle Hulme.
11 *March* 1957.

PAPER CHURCH

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

I read the article of the Principal of Wells with interest, having been ordained deacon in 1903 without having passed any examination for the diaconate.

It came about in this way: I was at the time a Cuddesdon student and that year the Principal, Canon J. O. Johnston, got permission from the bishops for students who were taking the full Cuddesdon course to send in their terminal examination papers to examining chaplains in lieu of having the ordinary examination. The purpose was that students who qualified under this scheme might spend their last term free from any anxiety about satisfying examiners.

I have never met any clergy to whom this scheme did not commend itself. It did not, however, last more than the one year because the examining chaplains apparently did not appreciate its purpose and did not inform us that they were satisfied until well on in the Advent season. We went to our ecclesiastical tailors in faith that we should not be turned down.

Canon Johnston felt that he had been frustrated, but I have always been glad that the experiment was tried in my own day.

Yours sincerely,
G. S. Richards.

Park Green Cottage,
Cranleigh,
Surrey.

EUCHARISTIC CONSECRATION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

My plea to Canon Sansbury not to abandon scholarly caution seems to have been more worth while than I had thought, if such a one as Mr Wigan is prepared to write so wildly as these words are that bear his name in the April number of THEOLOGY. There is no need to repeat what I have said with some care of phrasing. Let the reader able to judge in these matters look to see if the dogmatic positionings of Mr Wigan are to the point. Were the thanksgivings at the Last Supper consecratory, were they anything to do with the new intention that our Lord was to fix upon the grace loaf and loving cup of the solemn feastings of his people? If there is room for reasonable doubt here, then Canon Sansbury is guilty of the indiscretion to which I drew attention. The Thanksgiving of the second-century Eucharist is highly likely to be a descendant of the graces used by our Lord, but deeply differenced by the pressures of the risen Lord upon New Israel. The differencing may well not date from the Last Supper itself. That's the point.

As for the rhetoric about Cranmer, the Pope and Scripture, perhaps this is an indication that my remarks have not been studied carefully and sympathetically, that something is disturbing judgment. But let it be forgiven and forgotten, if it be just a flick of vituperation on the part of a fine fellow in a flurried fury.

Yours faithfully,
ROBERT SYMONDS.

LEICESTER.

BOOK REVIEWS

HE THAT COMETH. By S. Mowinckel. Blackwell. 45s.

The distinguished author intends his book to "lead up to the message of Jesus about the Son of Man, to show the presuppositions behind it and to present the development of the various factors, and the form in which they lay ready to be used, transformed, and fitted into a new unity by Him" (p. 445). The importance of this work for New Testament studies is therefore obvious, while students of the Old Testament must benefit greatly from the ample and judicious discussions of the ideal of kingship in ancient Israel, the Suffering Servant, and the development of the hope of future salvation in the later prophetic writings. The author's method has many laudable qualities: he defines his terms carefully, thus avoiding the temptations to irrelevancy which beset this subject; he always bases his studies on a sober estimate of the age of his material; he shows fine insight into the transmission and development of the prophetic literature—and here his earlier work on the "prophetic disciples" stands him in good stead; and above all he has a sympathy for ancient modes of thought which is always carefully controlled. The

argument of this important book can scarcely be summarized here, but some points of special interest may be mentioned.

The author believes that whereas the *expectation* of a future saviour-king belongs to the later period of biblical history, the *content* of that figure was derived from the ideal of kingship in early Israel. The nature of this ideal is therefore examined in what is one of the most valuable parts of the book. He finds a middle course between those who deny any important influences from oriental conceptions of divine kingship and those who are prone to exaggerate them; the former he finds guilty of seeking to explain away the evidence, while the latter have often misread it, arguing too hastily "from a community of outward form to identity of meaning and thought" (p. 88). Basing his description of Israelite kingship broadly on Old Testament evidence, he discusses the old ideal of the spirit-filled leader in the books of Judges and Samuel, the royal psalms—"the official ritual texts at the royal services" (p. 89), the prophetic movement which weighed a king in the balance of strict Yahwism, and the Deuteronomist who founded his theory of the national history on his ideal of kingship. He concludes that the Israelite ideal was distinctive, first, for the stress it laid upon the king's utter subordination to and dependence upon Yahweh and, secondly, for the insistence that the king's function is to be Yahweh's instrument in maintaining righteousness among his people. While in virtue of the king's spiritual endowment and adoption by Yahweh he is ideally raised above ordinary men (and in so far "divine"), there can be no question of his ever being identified with Yahweh in the cult. Such a lofty ideal could seldom approach realization and it was natural that it should be accompanied by a hope which looked to the future for its fulfilment. But this could only develop into messianism when entirely severed from association with contemporary rulers. Such a development could only take place after the loss of the monarchy—"Faith is born when human possibilities are exhausted" (p. 157). The decisive factor in producing genuine eschatology was the influence of Persian dualism.

The author's discussion of Deutero-Isaiah is particularly interesting. The prophet is found to have drawn on the system of ideas which was associated with the New Year Festival at Jerusalem and is reflected in the enthronement psalms. The author thus maintains his position against Snaith, for example, who has argued that it is the psalms which are dependent on Deutero-Isaiah.

With the definite removal of the king into the region of "future hope", mythological traits which had been subdued in the historical kingship now become more prominent. But the notable emphasis on the future king's "knowledge of God" is ascribed not to any ancient ideal of sacral kingship but to the prophetic teaching, and it is finely said that it means his living "constantly in personal fellowship with God, deriving all his power, his aims and the very nature of his being from this fellowship" (p. 180).

In his profound treatment of the Servant Songs the author adopts a clear and consistent interpretation of the Servant as originally a

historical individual whom the poet expected to be raised from the dead. Such an interpretation is bound to be much disputed, especially as it must depend upon the elimination of the word "Israel" from the text of Isaiah 49. 3. Divine kingship and in particular the "sufferings" of the king in the cult are said to have made no direct contribution to the concept of the Servant, who is essentially a prophetic figure and the climax of the prophetic movement. Judaism never grasped the essential meaning of Isaiah 53, which thus did not significantly affect the Messianic idea—"In spite of statements to the contrary, Judaism knows nothing of a suffering, dying and rising Messiah" (p. 327). The Targum of Isaiah 53 is quoted to good effect, for it has completely transformed the sense of the passage to make it accord with the normal Messianic hope.

An introductory linguistic discussion of the term "Son of Man" leads to the conclusion that it could be a definite Messianic designation and as such applied by Jesus to himself. The origin of the concept is not to be sought in Daniel 7, for "Daniel" is shown to have adapted an older tradition of a heavenly Son of Man which is presented more directly by the Similitudes of Enoch. Our author defends the pre-Christian date and the substantial integrity of the Similitudes. The origin of the Son of Man is rather found outside Israel in the widespread mythology of the Primordial Man, though no precision is possible here as the Jews will have learnt of these myths "from many quarters, in many varying forms and at different periods" (p. 431). Jesus derived the concept from his Galilean milieu and found that it suited his purpose far better than that of the Messiah. But he combined with it his own deep understanding of the Isaianic Suffering Servant and could thus regard himself as already the Son of Man before his exaltation.

The author has not discussed the Messianic ideas of the Qumran community; the two Messiahs of the Manual of Discipline should certainly have been brought into the discussion of the Damascus Fragments on p. 289. A section relating the argument to the ideas of salvation associated with personified Wisdom would have been valuable. Nevertheless, the author has given us good measure indeed. Above all he has established sound guiding lines in a region of biblical studies where they were urgently needed.

Finally, the translator, Mr G. W. Anderson, must be congratulated on a very fine piece of work. In spite of the many technical difficulties which he must have faced, he has achieved a very readable rendering.

J. H. Eaton.

University of Birmingham.

Via Media. By E. L. Mascall. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

This book is not, as its title might suggest, yet another attempt to distil the essence of the Anglican compromise. It is, in Dr Mascall's own phrase, an "essay in theological synthesis". He discusses the basic

doctrines of Christian theology—creation, trinity, incarnation, grace —in such a way as to bring out his thesis that orthodoxy consists in holding together notions which might seem at the outset to be incompatible, but in resisting the temptation to go off in one direction or another, which might seem to give an appearance of rationality from the standpoint of a this-worldly scheme of verification. This is a notion which has been worked out before, by Bardy in his *En Lisant les Pères*, and by Penido, who wrote a most profound study of the role of analogy (which is to all intents what Dr Mascall's principle comes to) in the whole range of dogmatic theology. Penido attempted the *tour de force* of trying to bring the doctrine of Transubstantiation into his pattern; but Dr Mascall wisely has not essayed this task.

In his introduction he attempts to ward off possible criticism of the highly abstract theological language he is constrained to use; though it is probably not only the "philosophers of the strict logical empiricist school" who will feel a growing uneasiness as they go along. Dr Mascall is a mathematician as well as a theologian, and seems to have a disconcerting habit of squeezing all the concreteness out of his images and words and, when his symbols have become decently desiccated and achieved the highest degree of abstraction, to handle them at last with ease and delight. Theological language, he says, has its own laws of behaviour and exacts its own type of training. This is true. But one of the laws of theological good behaviour is that its language shall have a close contact with historical reality. There are some passages of this book where we seem to have lost that contact altogether. Is there any meaning at all in saying that the Cappadocians believed that "the whole Godhead in its concrete totality was instantiated in each of the persons, paternally in the Father, filially in the Son, and pneumatically in the Spirit"? This sort of language is made even more questionable when it is set alongside the wonderful paraphrase by Prestige, who said that Trinitarian orthodoxy is summed up in the saying that God is one object *in* himself and three objects *to* himself.

Is it a mere difference of temperament, or is there something in the nature of Christian faith and truth, that makes us wary of what look very much like restatements of the problem we start with in the transposed terms of another language or group of images; and to prefer those pregnant apothegmata in which these profundities have been locked up in Scripture and tradition? Dr Mascall quotes with approval a number of them, like St Gregory Nazianzen's "not assumed, not healed". The problem is, whether we can ever advance very far beyond this kind of theological gnomon without peril.

The writer quotes a good deal from Dr Prestige and at one point to the effect that while the Council of Chalcedon saved Christianity from heresy, it was only at the cost of making theology abstract where it had hitherto been concrete. It had the effect of turning away speculation about the person of Christ from a standpoint based on psychology and expressed the mystery in terms of metaphysical phrases. "Official Christianity remained negative and abstract, and

for that reason abstraction became a necessity of theological thought". Dr Mascall is not altogether in agreement with this estimate of Prestige. "The use of abstraction is, after all, one of the ways in which we think about concrete realities", he says. But it is a commonplace that, by abstraction, what you gain in logical consistency you lose in existential significance. It would be possible to argue, on the basis of some even of Dr Mascall's own presuppositions, that Christian orthodoxy sets a higher value upon concrete significance than it does upon interior logical consistency. The evangelical redeemer, says Dr Mascall, quoting Prestige once more, has been desiccated to a logical mummy.

It is for this reason that many will find his last section, on the doctrine of grace, more congenial than the earlier chapters. He defends with vigour the conception of creaturely deification, being careful to draw attention to the safeguards found where this language is used. In defending this Catholic language against the strictures of modern Protestants, Mascall draws attention to a Thomist tag which is unfortunately not as well known as *gratia non tollit naturam sed perficit*; it is, "grace requires nature as its raw material, in the sort of way that faith must have some sort of natural knowledge as a foundation upon which to work" (*Sic enim fides praesupponit cognitionem naturalem, sicut gratia naturam*), and in his exposition of what is really implied by Catholic doctrine he does a good deal to remove the sting of fashionable criticisms. He has always been fond of the splendid *Essai sur le Problème Théologique* of Père Charlier, and from it he quotes a passage where the French theologian pleads for a recognition that what is first in the divine intention discloses the truth about ourselves much more clearly than our own metaphysical "certainties". Thus we are children of God long before and much more significantly than we are "rational animals". The essential truth about ourselves—our being adopted as sons in the Son—is a thousand times more completely "the truth" about ourselves than anything else we might discover about ourselves by the slow build-up of human knowledge, from induction, inspection, and inference.

The very meaning of the divine plan for us is that he desires to make us his children and so creates for us a nature which is capable of receiving this inestimable benefit.

The book ends with some discussion of St Gregory Palamas and the notion of the "divine energies" as an attempt from the standpoint of Eastern orthodox theology to come to grips with this problem of the divine human encounter.

Dr Mascall promised us an essay in theological synthesis, and he has certainly given us a bird's-eye view of its fundamental themes of a kind which is increasingly rare amongst us. The preoccupation with history has made us weak in synthetic as well as in speculative theological discussion, and his work should do something to encourage a wide circle of readers to remind themselves that these great doctrines, though they are not exactly communicable as they stand, have a profound significance for the life of Christian prayer and a

value considerably higher than that of information acquired to satisfy theological examiners. That one should have to say such a thing is a measure of how great has been our decline in this field.

G. L. PHILLIPS.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

HENRY NEWMAN: AN AMERICAN IN LONDON, 1708–43. By Leonard W. Cowie. S.P.C.K., for the Church Historical Society. 30s.

Beneath the anonymity of the eighteenth-century minute- and correspondence-books of the S.P.C.K. there lurks the figure of one of its most devoted servants, Henry Newman, whom Dr Cowie has rescued from an undeserved oblivion and presented to the learned world as a singularly self-effacing, industrious and attractive character. Newman, indeed, had already attracted the attention of Dr W. K. Lowther Clarke, whose studies in *Eighteenth-Century Piety* included two essays on him, but they were only an *apéritif* for the more solid fare now provided by Dr Cowie.

Henry Newman was well fitted by his early upbringing in the American Plantations, and particularly by his education at Harvard, for the service of the Society so deeply concerned with religious affairs of the New World. Indeed, he brought to England exactly the right kind of experience to fit him for the secretaryship of S.P.C.K. He succeeded Humphrey Wanley in this position in 1708 and held it until his death in 1743. Dr Cowie gives an interesting and informative account of the influences at Harvard which moulded Newman's theological and religious outlook, and which were to be reflected in the multifarious activities in which his new office engaged him. For, in addition to the Society's literary work in the publication and dissemination of books and tracts, it was intimately connected with the Charity School Movement, with the East India Mission of Lutheran ministers, and with various schemes for the relief of persecuted foreign Protestants seeking an asylum in England, especially the Vaudois and French emigrants. Dr Cowie gives a particularly interesting and useful account of the S.P.C.K.'s relationship with the Danish-German-Lutheran missionaries at Tranquebar, including the delicate question of the employment by "the Church Society" of non-episcopal ministers and the problems arising therefrom. If the Charity Schools were accused by their enemies as being centres of political disaffection, the India mission seemed to some to undermine the principles of the Church of England as regards episcopal polity and ordination. Even more difficult, and certainly less rewarding, were Newman's efforts to control the administration of royal and other bounties to foreign Protestants, and most particularly the work of the committee appointed to subsidize converts from Popery coming from abroad. In addition to these activities, Newman acted as unofficial agent for a number of American interests and individuals in England, and as official colonial agent for New Hampshire in London. Yet again, he was munificent in private charity and assistance to a host

of deserving individuals and causes; and finally he was drawn into the negotiations for the establishment of General Oglethorpe's colony of Georgia and for the settlement there of persecuted Protestant refugees from the prince-archbishopric of Salzburg.

Newman's career represented, therefore, a cross-section of English life, especially on its ecclesiastical and philanthropic sides, during the generation of his service to S.P.C.K. Across his path and across the pages of this biography, stride the leading figures of the contemporary Church of England—Wake, Gibson, Thomas Bray and Berkeley, to mention but a few; whilst Newman's many personal connexions, both in the New and Old Worlds, added to the width and variety of his work. Dr Cowie, like his subject, has visited America in search of information; and his biography is well based on thorough and careful research into manuscript and printed sources on both sides of the Atlantic. He has written a most informative and interesting study, serviceable both as a biography and an account of the S.P.C.K. during the important years of Newman's secretaryship. If it was characteristic of (though not creditable to) the age, that the minutes of the Society's first meeting after Newman's death recorded no expression of regret at the loss of so faithful and devoted a servant, equally characteristic was the self-effacing nature of his services. Dr Cowie has found evident difficulty in tracing the personal and individual characteristics of the man underneath the impersonal activities of the secretary. But he is to be congratulated warmly on his biography of one of the holy and humble men of heart, whose single-minded devotion (even in the eighteenth century) made the deserts of ecclesiastical history to blossom as the rose.

CAMBRIDGE. NORMAN SYKES.

YOUR PARISH CHURCH. The Twelfth Report of the Central Council for the Care of Churches. Church Information Board. 4s. 6d.

The importance of the Central Council for the Care of Churches should be evident enough, particularly to the parish priests of the English Church, who together have in their custody a vast treasure of architecture and the fine arts which can all too easily be savaged by ignorance, lack of sensibility or the kind of sloth which pretends it is far too busy with the work of the kingdom of God to have time to spare for the niceties of church furnishing. As this admirable report says of shoddily treated and ill-ordered churches (markedly of the nineteenth century, despite the many excellent buildings to its credit): "To expect people—especially the younger generation—to continue to worship in them as they are is a severe trial of faith in God, who, we are taught, is himself perfect beauty. We badly need to look again at these too-familiar surroundings, trying to put ourselves in the place of the stranger not already convinced of the Church's message of hope and salvation, and to whom the liturgy is unfamiliar and often unintelligible. Is the building itself going to help in any way to make him say, 'Surely the Lord is in this place',

and, having come in perhaps from curiosity or in a blind search for the unknown God, will it bring him to his knees by awe and wonder at what he sees, and senses beyond what he sees?" Anyone who knows intimately a fine and knowledgeably cared-for church can confirm from experience that this silent evangelism is not merely fanciful but can be a more real and powerful influence nowadays, when people travel so widely about the countryside and have so many facilities for improving their aesthetic appreciation, than many clergymen apparently realize. Again, anyone who habitually looks into unfamiliar churches in passing will recognize the reference here to "brass knobs, a lifeless reredos, texts and stencil work which defy all canons of taste. It is true we may have become sentimentally attached to these things, or may be unaware of their ugliness, just as a man deep in sin may be unaware of his condition. . . . It is necessary to re-accustom the faithful to beauty." A frequent and specious plea is that "Victorian Gothic" is hopelessly intractable material; which makes the middle section of this report of outstanding value. It consists of eighteen full-page plates, with commentary, illustrating the transformation of several nineteenth-century churches by sensitive handling. There are also, among other useful contributions, a special section on dampness in churches and a characteristic introductory essay by the Dean of York, who needs no commendation.

Considering that the Central Council is the official body appointed to advise upon the care of our Anglican churches and has surely the soundest reputation, it ought almost to be a matter of obligation for every Church Council in the country to acquire and pass round among its members a copy of this triflingly priced report, whenever it appears (because of various exigences it is five years since the last). And what valid excuse any incumbent who is not purblind or senile could reasonably produce for not taking note of it, is difficult to conceive.

John H. L. Waterson.

Stoke D'Abernon.

SHORTER NOTICES

L'Église en état de mission. By Léon-Joseph Suenens. Desclée de Brouwer. N.p.

This vigorously written book by the auxiliary Bishop of Malines is both stirring and stimulating to read. It is healthily dogmatic in its insistence on the Church's mission as its life. The author makes it clear that we have entered a new phase of Church history which necessitates the mobilization of all Christians. The whole Church must be a missionary community. Election involves mission. The Christian mission is the out-working of the implications of every Christian baptism, for baptism commits us to mission. It is not possible to separate the Church in its activity of mission from its activity in prayer or the sacramental life: all belong together. The illusion that the masses are unconvertible and that evangelism must be post-

poned for two or three generations until the social revolution has done its work is forcefully dispelled.

If we cannot talk to the Roman Catholic Church about reunion we might make a happy start by talking with some of its French leaders about evangelism: we should have much to learn. It is to be hoped this exposition of the Church's mission will be made available in English.

DOUGLAS WEBSTER.

BLACKHEATH.

The April number of *Moral Welfare* contains a paper on "Marriage and Prayer" by the Rev. P. B. Graham, and we should like to call attention to it. It was originally read at the Theology and Ministry Convention at Oxford in September 1956.

STUDIES IN EPHESIANS. Edited by F. L. Cross. Mowbray. 12s. 6d.

"Cross's conventions", that clerical equivalent of Beaks and Dons, has rapidly established itself as an institution, and here are its literary first-fruits, a series of papers on the authorship and theology of Ephesians.

Space forbids the summarizing of each of the eight papers, and it would be invidious to select any of them for special comment. But two reflections of a general character are suggested by a reading of the book. First, it registers a change in Anglican theological scholarship over the past few decades. A generation ago orthodoxy was thought to be bound up with a conservative attitude to questions of New Testament criticism. Hoskyns, and still more R. H. Lightfoot, have broken that alliance, and a new alignment is emerging comparable to that which prevails in the Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.: a fearless acceptance of radical criticism, combined with a firm adherence to orthodoxy. Such a position has both the strength and the dangers of Catholic Modernism.

The second reflection is that in a convention designed to bring together parochial and academic clergy and presumably to foster a dialogue between them, it is disquieting to find that of the eight contributors only one is a parish priest, and that even he has one foot in a university! Not that we would have the parochial clergy vie with the academics in a display of erudition. Rather, they should bring from their practical experience an understanding of the word of God to enrich, complement and correct that of their non-parochial colleagues. In this way the conventions might be transformed from an academic monologue into a genuine dialogue.

The editor appends a bibliography to Ephesians, and since German books are included there should be added Ernst Percy's *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe*, Lund, 1946.

R. H. FULLER.

SEABURY-WESTERN SEMINARY,
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS.

St Luke's Life of Christ. By J. B. Phillips. With illustrations by Edward Ardizzone. Collins. 12s. 6d.

A curious combination, this, of modern translation and old-fashioned illustration. The scratchy illustrations remind me of Victorian books such as I was sometimes given to read as a child. I do not like them; but that is neither here nor there. The point is that they go oddly with an untraditional translation.

The translation has won for itself a firm place in the affections of those who want something modern. What is a tonic to some I find an irritant. For this is much more than a translation of the Greek. I do not find the following in my Greek Testament, "In the congregation was a woman who for eighteen years had been enfeebled from some psychological cause". Nor do I find in the New Testament the portrait of governessy petulance such as given by, "You really are an unbelieving and difficult people, replied Jesus". At times we lapse into sheer vulgarity. It is the end of the story of the walk to Emmaus, and the italics are not mine. "Do stay with us. It is nearly evening and soon the day will be over. So he went indoors to stay with them. *Then it happened.*" Feminine practitioners of the art of the detective story are fond of that gambit.

F. C. Synge.

The Deanery,
George.

Making Prayer Real. By Lynn J. Radcliffe. Longmans. 18s. 6d.

The title, if uninspiring, is apt. Dr Radcliffe, we are told in the blurb, is "one of the most eminent Methodist Pastors in the United States".

Guides to prayer are legion, but this one deserves reading for its clarity and positive approach. So many books deal with the difficulties of prayer. This one deals with prayer, its joys, its demands, its necessity; only incidentally, its difficulty.

The author has a wide knowledge of Catholic literature and terminology. The latter he translates with the minimum of confusion into everyday speech. It is a remarkable fact that, in spite of this wide knowledge, there is no sign at all of any appreciation or even awareness of the Catholic Church as the Body of Christ nor of the Communion of Saints.

The Priest of the People. A Symposium. Blackfriars Publications. 4s. 6d.

Originally published in *The Life of the Spirit*, these articles make easy and pleasant reading, but are too short to be of more than passing interest. Priests will find some good matter for short devotional reading.

Brian Oman, O.G.S.

Cardiff Docks.

THOMAS CRANMER, 1489-1556. Three commemorative lectures delivered in Lambeth Palace. Church Information Board. 2s. 6d.

There were many matters which Luther and Cranmer did not have in common, but in this they were at one: they were both men honestly following the profession of scholarship, then finding themselves, incongruously, thrust to the centre of ecclesiastical affairs. Upon this and upon the results that flow from it, depends much of the history of the Reformation. It may be fair to see this as a thread connecting these three lectures delivered at Lambeth last year in commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the death of Thomas Cranmer. The first, by Professor Sykes, places Cranmer's life in its historical setting, and explains the course of his career by his basic ideas about the duty of a Christian in society. Professor Ratcliff discusses the liturgical work, in particular the question of the extent of Cranmer's responsibility for the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552, and the bibliography, both ancient and contemporary, which he used in the work. The Bishop of Winchester concludes with a shorter essay on Cranmer's correspondences with the elusive Anglican temper.

The first two lectures give a useful sketch of the present state of studies on Cranmer, both historical and liturgical. The third perhaps says little more than that Cranmer was a scholar-prelate, and that the Church of England has been ruled and moulded by many such in the years since 1556.

J. L. HOULDEN.

HUNSLET CLERGY HOUSE,
LEEDS.

THE TWELVE TOGETHER. By T. Ralph Morton. Iona Community. 7s. 6d.

MAN AND HIS SOCIETY. By Norman J. Bull. Religious Education Press. 7s. 6d.

YOU AND YOUR CONDUCT. By Marcus Donovan. Faith Press. 6s.

All three books are concerned with the practice of Christian faith in daily living. Mr Donovan wants a "recovery of Catholic Faith and Practice", "not . . . uncoloured by the experience of five centuries of Anglicanism". His book is a string of short essays, in a lively style, containing a good deal of useful instruction and stimulating comment. Many Christians will disagree with some of his statements, but his sketchy treatment of a wide variety of topics will appeal to those who find a more coherent presentation too difficult to follow.

Man and His Society is one of a series of books written for teachers and lecturers in education. It is clearly and attractively written and printed, and disappointing. About a third of the book consists of summaries of social and political developments in our civilization, upon which Mr Bull comments that what we value most in "the British way of life" is rooted in Christianity and due largely to men

inspired by Christian faith. But he has very little to say about the distinctively Christian attitudes to human society. There is hardly a hint of human life's need of redemption or of the Christian's amphibian situation in two orders of life at once. Except in Chapter II on "Man and His Home", the Bible is used to illustrate rather than to form the basis of Mr Bull's teaching, and there are marked contrasts between his chapter on "Man and His Work" and the conclusions of Alan Richardson's *The Biblical Doctrine of Work*. He has little to contribute to contemporary discussion about the foundation of community life, the only references to the Church are vague, and there is no indication that in the Church is to be found the secret of life in fellowship and what that secret is. Teachers and students may be convinced by this book that Christian faith has been a dominant influence in shaping the British way of life, but they will learn little about traditional or recent Christian thinking about Church, community, and state.

The Twelve Together has a more limited aim and a greater value. Mr Morton is convinced that "we are not likely to take the life of Jesus seriously until we begin seriously to study what he was doing with his disciples. Until we see them a little more clearly we shall not see Jesus himself" (p. 10). "We try to see Jesus without them. We give to them as disciples a subordinate and unessential place in the Gospels. And as they become shadowy our thinking about our own discipleship becomes likewise rather vague" (p. 15). "When we regard the road that the disciples followed with Jesus as a necessary road for them but of secondary interest to us, we are left with a theory or an institution or a religion, but we do not know the life he gives" (pp. 128–9). "Unless we begin to see the part given to the disciples to play and see ourselves as heirs of the same part we do not understand the Gospel or the Church" (p. 20). His book is therefore a careful examination of the training and experience of the first disciples. Occasionally I think that he overstates his case, but *The Twelve Together* is a useful corrective to the exaggerated individualism with which we usually approach the gospels. What Mr Morton has to say has immediate relevance to the Church's methods of evangelism and edification to-day, and to the situation we meet in industry and many professions, where much of the work is now done by groups.

R. R. Acheson.

Bristol.

The Third Revolution. A Study of Psychiatry and Religion. By Karl Stern. Michael Joseph. 15s.

When sixty years ago Freud began to enunciate the principles of psycho-analysis, who could have imagined that to-day there would be doctors and priests who regard the psycho-analytic method as potentially a very powerful buttress to the Faith? And yet that is actually what has come about! The battle within psychology is still being

fought out. In the meantime it is encouraging to note that an increasing number of psychiatrists are pondering over the evidence which their experience of "the healing dialogue" yields, and are attempting to reconcile that evidence with the poetic-intuitive truths of religion. How well one of them has succeeded can be judged by reading Dr Karl Stern's 250-page book *The Third Revolution* (the two preceding revolutions are those of the economist and the biologist).

Dr Stern is a Roman Catholic, a practising psychiatrist, and a philosopher who seems just as much at home with the thought of St Thomas Aquinas and Kierkegaard as he is with that of his contemporary social scientists. Anyone who wants a clear and simple account of the development of psychiatry, and a Christian appraisal of the claims made for it, should read this book. On one reader, at least, it has left the impression that to the extent that we succeed in integrating scientific knowledge about men with the Christian idea of man, to that extent we also succeed in narrowing the breach between Catholic and Protestant.

T. M. Heron.

Welwyn Garden City.

The Bible as History. By Werner Keller. Hodder and Stoughton. 25s.

The sub-title is "Archaeology confirms the Book of Books". I wish that someone would write a book sub-titled "The Bible confirms the findings of archaeologists". Such a book would not be on the defensive: it would not seek to demonstrate either with shy delight or with brash confidence the surprising, always surprising, fact that the Bible is true; nor would it seek to defend the Bible's virtue on the wrong grounds.

This book is a fine specimen of its kind. It is well written and well translated; it inspires confidence; it is full of facts attractively presented; it is well illustrated; it does not clutter up the mind with the unfinished debates of experts; it is beautifully produced.

It is the sort of book that will be an irritant to some and to others a stimulant. I myself find it the former. It "defends" the Exodus narrative, for example, by showing that there is no need to postulate miracle. Thus on p. 127, "In this area there was at one time a Sea of Reeds. The waterway to the Bitter Lakes could be forded at several points. Fords can actually be traced there. The flight from Egypt by way of the Sea of Reeds is therefore perfectly credible." And again, two pages later, "Time and again more or less profound discussions have taken place over the question of the quails and the manna. What a vast amount of disbelief they have occasioned. The Bible is telling us about things that are miraculous and inexplicable! On the contrary, quails and manna are perfectly matter-of-fact occurrences."

I find this sort of treatment an irritant for this reason: that it

lightly sweeps away Israel's grounds for believing that Jehovah was mightily at work in the Exodus, and the "mighty hand and the stretched-out arm" shrivels into a seasonal phenomenon. Thus the conclusion of such books as this seems to be that the Bible is true in its facts but false in its faith.

On the other hand, there are those who will find this book a stimulant. They will be confirmed in their practice of reading the Bible by this demonstration of its truth, and they will grow in the faith of Israel and the Church. They only want assurance that the Bible is true, and then they will nourish themselves upon it. For such this book is an excellent tonic.

F. C. SYNGE.

THE DEANERY,
GEORGE.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: C. A. Mace (Ed.), *British Philosophy in the Mid-Century* (30s.).

BLACKFRIARS PUBLICATIONS: M. E. Boismard, O.P., *St John's Prologue* (12s.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: W. L. Knox, *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*, Vol. II (21s.).

CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY (U.S.A.): F. W. Kates (Ed.), *Walking with God* (50 cents).

COLLINS: William Purcell, *Pilgrim's Programme* (10s. 6d.).

FABER AND FABER: Josef Pieper, *Justice* (12s. 6d.).

FAITH PRESS: *Prayers for a Silence* [a useful evocative of mental prayer] (3s. 6d.).

GUILD OF ST RAPHAEL: *The Doctor and his Patients—the Parish Priest and his People* (6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Raynor C. Johnson, *Nurslings of Immortality* (25s.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: J. W. C. Wand, *Aspects of Advent* (1s. 3d.); H. F. Lovell Cocks, *The Wondrous Cross* (4s.); Stephen Neill, *The Cross in the Church* (4); A. E. Gould, *Antidote to Doubt* (6s. 6d.); R. W. Hugh Jones, *Conversation Piece* (1s. 6d.); L. J. Tizard, *Dealing with our Doubts* (1s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: E. A. Maycock, *A Letter of Wise Counsel* (2s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: Ian Pettitt, *Sermon Outlines on the Lord's Prayer* (2s.); Richard Tatlock, *An Easter Festival of Nine Lessons with Hymns and Carols* (3s. 6d.); E. W. Trueman Dicken, *Living with God* (5s.).

ST ANDREW PRESS: Robert Davidson, *The Service of God* (1s. 3d.).

ST ANTHONY'S PRESS: A. G. Dickens, *The Marian Reaction in the Diocese of York, Part I, The Clergy* (3s. 6d.).

SEABURY PRESS (U.S.A.): W. Norman Pittenger, *The Church, the Ministry, and Reunion* (n.p.).

SHEED AND WARD: Karl Adam, *The Roots of the Reformation* [reprint of *One and Holy*, see THEOLOGY, May 1950, pp. 161 f.] (3s. 6d.); F. J. Sheed, *Marriage and the Family* [reprinted from the author's *Society and Sanity*] (3s. 6d.).

TYNDALE PRESS: A. M. Stibbs, *God became Man* (1s. 6d.); John Murray, *Principles of Conduct* (15s.); P. E. Hughes, *Scripture and Myth* (1s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

THE WILL AND THE WAY

HARRY BLAMIRES — **15s. net**

"Mr Blamire's discussion of the meaning of vocation and its problems in contemporary society is admirable. . . . This is a book to which the word important might be applied, not in the sense that it marks a turning point in thought, but because the author, writing with deep Christian conviction, looks with an honest freshness of personal thought at the world of our time." *Times Literary Supplement.*

CHRIST AND HIS CHURCH

A. NYGREN — **10s. 6d. net**

"This is partly a work of New Testament exegesis, partly an elaboration of an ecumenical theology. . . . This is a book essentially to be read for the detail of the argument." *Manchester Guardian.*

DISCIPLINES OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

E. HAYMAN — **5s. net**

The life of prayer expounded as a process of learning the love of God, the humility, the obedience and the purity of Jesus, and of learning to share His pain.

THE PRAYER BOOK PATTERN

CAROLINE ADAMS — **12s. 6d. net**

"It is refreshing to read a book designed to show that 'If the Prayer Book pattern is followed, God reigns supreme.' The book can be thoroughly recommended."

View Review

THE SEARCH FOR PERFECTION

W. R. MATTHEWS — **8s. 6d. net**

The articles contributed to the Daily Telegraph by the Dean of St. Paul's are valued by many. Many others will also be glad to possess this selection from his articles.

PUBLIC RELATIONS FOR THE PARISH

GEORGE ROWLES — **3s. 6d. net**

Mr Rowles' long experience in Fleet Street qualifies him admirably for the task of explaining the principles of "Public Relations" and for giving down-to-earth advice on public relations for the parish.

S · P · C · K

White Kennett, 1660-1728

Bishop of Peterborough

G. V. Bennett **42s. net**

"Dr Bennett has based this wholly admirable study on unpublished mss and publications which hitherto have received little attention. The result is a totally new appraisal of the Bishop . . . a real contribution to a deeper understanding of the relations of Church and State of those times."

Times Literary Supplement.

Activities of the Puritan Faction of the Church of England, 1625-33

I. Calder **25s. net**

Professor Calder has discovered documents which give the full record of a suit before the Court of Exchequer in which the Crown sued a group of Puritans who had formed themselves into a body of feoffees for the purchase of impropriations to support Puritan lecturers. This scholarly edition of the records of the case will be of great interest and service to students of Puritanism in this period.

Anglicanism

Editors: **P. E. More & F. L. Cross** **35s. net**

The third impression of this standard work is now ready.

S · P · C · K